

Town Meeting

Illinois U Library



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by Stations of the American Broadcasting Co.



U. S. Pat. Off.

How Should the United Nations Deal With Future Aggression?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, Jr.

Speakers

ABRAHAM H. FELLER

H. V. KALTENBORN

(See also page 12)

COMING

—November 7, 1950—

**What Should the Small Investor Do About
Government Bonds and the Stock Market?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 26  \$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.



THE BROADCAST OF OCTOBER 24:

"How Should the United Nations Deal With Future Aggression?"

Mr. DENNY	3
Mr. FELLER	4
Mr. KALTENBORN	6
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	10
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
THE LISTENER TALKS BACK	15



THE BROADCAST OF NOVEMBER 7:

"What Should the Small Investor Do About Government Bonds and the Stock Market?"



The Broadcast of October 24, 1950, from 9:00 to 9:30 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company network, originated at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C., through the coöperation of the Information and Education Section of the United States Air Force.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



OCTOBER 24, 1950

VOL. 16, No. 26

How Should the United Nations Deal With Future Aggression?

Announcer:

We hear first from Colonel Henry J. Amen, the Commanding Officer of Bolling Air Force Base, located in Washington, D. C.

Colonel Amen:

Tonight America's Town Meeting of the Air is coming to you from one of the oldest Air Force installations in the United States. We are located on the east bank of the historic Potomac, in view of the Nation's Capitol.

Bolling Air Force Base, which celebrated its 33d birthday, is made up of men and women from every state and practically every community in America. Like all American communities, we try to provide opportunities for recreation, worship, and education. In our educational center, we conduct a complete high school program, as well as undergraduate and graduate college classes.

This Town Meeting provides us with an opportunity to participate in the discussion of a topic which is of interest and importance to each one of us. And now I am happy to present your moderator, the president of Town Hall and founder of America's Town Meeting of the Air, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. Colonel Amen, we are happy to be your guests here at Bolling Air Force Base tonight, but we regret that it brings to a close our tour of Air Force

bases which we have taken in coöperation with the officers and airmen in your Information and Education program. On this, the fifth birthday of the United Nations, it's appropriate that our citizens, as well as the men and women in the Armed Forces, examine this organization in which the freedom-loving peoples of the world have pinned so much faith and hope.

One of the great strengths of our democratic system is our habit of self-analysis and self-criticism. If the time ever comes when we cease to examine, criticize, and appraise our democratic institutions, then democracy and Western civilization will be done for.

When we pose tonight's question, "How Should the United Nations Deal With Future Aggression?" we are dealing with a very practical problem which concerns the life and welfare of every human being alive today. We've asked Mr. Abraham Feller, General Counsel for the United Nations, and Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, veteran news analyst, to direct our attention to the central issues in this problem. Their views, of course, are their own and have no relation to Air Force policy.

We'll hear first from Mr. Abraham Feller, former law professor at both Harvard and Yale, who has held many posts in the United States Government and is now General Counsel and Director of the Legal Department of the United Nations. Mr. Feller. (*Applause*)

Mr. Feller:

The only way to prevent or resist aggression is by collective strength. I'm sure Mr. Kaltenborn and I are agree on this point. This means military power, but not only military power. It means building an international community, strong in all of its parts, and the extension of the rule of law to that community.

The prompt and practical action of the United Nations in meeting aggression in Korea was no accident. It happened because the nations of the world possessed the rallying point in the Charter of the United Nations. The long debate over the machinery of the Charter tended to conceal its real strength, a statement of purposes and principles which set forth the strivings of mankind for peace and a better and more secure life. When the crucial moment came, it was demonstrated that men and nations will fight to uphold collective security against armed aggression.

The General Assembly is now on the point of adopting

series of epoch-making proposals. A Peace Observation Patrol will be established. The Assembly will be enabled to act speedily on 24 hours' notice. The member states will be asked to maintain units of their own forces for the service of the United Nations. And the Collective Measures Committee will study methods to maintain and strengthen international peace.

If these recommendations of the Assembly are soundly implemented by the member states, we shall see created for the first time an effective world-wide military system to meet future aggression.

It is true that this will be a system resting upon the willingness of nations to respond to moral rather than legal obligations, but experience has taught us that it is the desire of nations to defend the peace which really counts in the end.

We can consider ourselves fortunate that the authors of the Charter were wise enough to create a flexible instrument adaptable to future circumstances and able to meet unforeseeable contingencies. While they conferred on the Security Council the primary responsibility for international peace and security, they set up a General Assembly representing all members with wide powers to consider any question relating to international peace and security.

So long as the Security Council cannot agree on the creation of an armed force, the new system can be made to work as a significant deterrent to future aggression. The Assembly now becomes the focus and fulcrum of international effort.

We are even more fortunate that the Charter set up an organization competent to deal on a universal basis with international questions of every kind and sort. Had the United Nations been intended merely as an international policeman, it might well have failed long since. Its basic strength lies in its mandate of continuous concern with the conciliation and settlement of international disputes, the advancement of economic and social betterment, the fostering of human rights, and the development of international law.

As the forum for the discussion and contact among all peoples and all economic and political systems in the world—and that includes all systems, those we dislike as well as those we like—it furnishes the only hope for the eventual settlement of fundamental differences which otherwise might break the world apart.

“How should the United Nations deal with future aggres-

sion?" By working hard and continuously on all of these fronts. And this I take it is precisely what President Truman meant in the significant speech which he made this morning before the United Nations. If we give the peoples of the world the hope for a better life, we will decrease the temptations for starting a future aggression and increase the will and ability of peoples everywhere to resist it.

There is no magic formula in this prescription. Peace is hard to attain in our troubled and strife-torn world. Never before in history, however, has so likely an opportunity for building the foundations of a secure and decent world order been presented. There is every indication that the United Nations will not let that opportunity pass unheeded. (Applause)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Feller, for a very able statement of the case for the United Nations on her fifth birthday. And now, our next speaker, who has also watched the United Nations from the time it was born and has just recently returned from a trip to Europe where he's seen how it has been functioning. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, known to radio listeners as the Dean of American Radio Commentators. Dean Kaltenborn. (Applause)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

I have no quarrel with Mr. Feller's endorsement of the Acheson plan for meeting aggression. It is a step in the right direction, but only a step.

He cites joint United Nations actions in Korea as proof of what can be done. May I remind him that it proves just as clearly what cannot be done? Fifty-three nations condemned aggression, but at the end of four months of war, one British Brigade and one Philippine regiment are the only United Nations land forces now in Korea, and they only arrived after the major crisis had been met by United States and South Korean forces.

What happened in Korea is a fair example of how long it might take to mobilize and put into action the scattered military forces of 60 nations. It was only the fortuitous presence of 100,000 American troops in near-by Japan that prevented communist occupation of all of Korea. Let us not sit back and assume that hereafter there will be a fully equipped, completely unified United Nations force ready to spring into

action at the Assembly's call. Years must pass before such a force can be created and made effective.

In the meantime, the world says, "Let Uncle Sam do it, and let Uncle Sam pay for it." It is time we and the rest of the world realize that there is a limit to what even we can do.

The United Nations would be much more unified and much stronger in the face of future aggression if it got rid of the Soviet Union. Only because Russia boycotted Council meetings could the United Nations Council act against aggression in Korea. When Russia returned to give Soviet delegate Malik a chance to preside, he blocked all effective Council action for the entire month he was in control.

Ever since the Assembly session began in September, Soviet delegate Vishinsky has done nothing but delay, obstruct, and sabotage Assembly action. Soviet vetoes now total nearly half a hundred.

We know that the Soviet Union, through force and sabotage, has placed 500 million people of 13 nations behind the Iron Curtain. We know that she has violated some 36 treaties and agreements since 1938. At this moment, she is sinking American ships and killing American soldiers by her actions in Korea and by sowing illegal mines in Korean waters.

When a League of Nations special committee was set up in 1939 to consider the charges made by Finland against the Soviet Union, it found that Russia was guilty of violating seven treaties, and the Soviet Union was then expelled from the League of Nations without a single negative vote. The time has come for the United Nations to follow suit.

Let the United Nations now appoint a committee to investigate the part played by the Soviet Union in stimulating, arming, and supporting aggression against the Republic of Korea. If the United Nations committee finds that the Soviet Union is guilty, let it order Soviet expulsion. Why go on providing such a power with a propaganda forum, or with the moral advantage of respectable associates? The first step to help the United Nations deal effectively with future aggression is to expel the proved aggressor. (Applause)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Well now there, we have a real issue between you and Mr. Feller. Mr. Feller, have you a comment, or a question you'd like to ask Mr. Kaltenborn before we take the questions from the audience?

Mr. Feller: Well, Mr. Denny, I would like to ask Mr. Kalten-

born this question. He stated that the members of the United Nations were slow in sending their forces to Korea. But isn't the very purpose of the proposals which we have just discussed to put the members of the United Nations in the position to respond more promptly next time, and also to spread the burden around—the burden of maintaining peace and security so that one country alone will not have to carry it?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Mr. Feller, I agree that that is the purpose but I have very grave doubts as to whether or not that purpose can be accomplished. Each country will reserve for itself the right to determine whether or not it will act against aggression, and we are, alas, a long, long way from the development of a united, effective fighting force to which each one of the member nations will make a contribution. It may come in later years, but as the world stands today, with all the selfishness and the nationalism and the fear of the two mightiest powers, Russia and the United States, the smaller nations are going to go mighty slow in aligning themselves on the one side or the other, and I think our experience in Korea proves that that is true.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn, have you a question for Mr. Feller?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, Mr. Feller, I should like to ask you how we are going to exercise compulsion on nations to fulfill their obligations to the United Nations if they feel that their immediate national interest is opposed, as India now feels that its national interest is opposed to taking a decisive stand against aggression in Korea?

Mr. Feller: The organization of the world today is such that you cannot rely on compulsion to force nations to live up to their obligations or to carry out recommendations of the United Nations. We now face a situation in the world where we must see to it that nations unite and carry out their duties to the international community on the basis of the principles which are set forth in the Charter. The day may come when the international community will be strong enough to exercise compulsion. Now, however, the compulsion must be that of moral obligation rather than the obligation of strength and force.

Mr. Denny: Thank you very much, gentlemen. Now, while we get ready for our question period, here is a message for our Town Hall listeners.

Announcer: How well do you know your neighbors? No, I don't mean your next-door neighbors or those who drop in occasionally for a visit. I mean those neighbors in other parts of the world whose help we need in either a cold or a hot war. What do you know about the leaders and people of France? Of Italy? What of the people of Turkey which stands squarely in the way of Russia's demands for a warm water port? What is the common man like, in India or Japan?

Mary Belle Decker's new book, *The World We Saw With Town Hall*, gives you intimate glimpses of the leaders and people of twelve world capitals visited by the Town Meeting party last summer. If you really want to understand your neighbors, you should read Mrs. Decker's fascinating account of this trip. All profits from the sale of this book go to Town Hall. You may secure *The World We Saw* from your book store or direct from the publisher, Richard R. Smith, 120 E. 39th Street, New York City. The price is \$3.

And now, to continue our Town Meeting here at Bolling Air Force Base, in Washington, D. C., we return you to our moderator, Mr. Denny.

COMING

—November 14, 1950—

Are We Expecting Too Much of Our Schools?

—November 21, 1950—

Do We Understand Asia?

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: We'll start with the gentleman here, please.

Man: Mr. Feller, should a nation in sympathy with the aggressor be required to furnish armed forces to suppress this aggressor?

Mr. Denny: That's a nice question of principle, Mr. Feller.

Mr. Feller: I take it that a nation which is in sympathy with an aggressor would hardly be likely to respond to the recommendations of the General Assembly.

Mr. Denny: It just wouldn't do it?

Mr. Feller: That's right.

Mr. Denny: All right, here's a gentleman over here on the aisle.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, isn't it better to retain Russia in the United Nations in the hope of reaching eventual agreement than risk a sure war by expelling them and breaking of relations?

Mr. Denny: That's what the lawyers call a leading question.

Mr. Kaltenborn: In the first place, you don't risk a sure war by expelling Russia from the United Nations any more than there was war when she was expelled from the League of Nations. Russia, as a matter of fact, expelled herself until she decided to come back in order to have Malik ruin action on Korea. Therefore, you pose the wrong kind of a question.

No, you don't risk failure to get Russian coöperation by expelling her. On the contrary, you put her on notice that until she behaves in an international manner she has no business in an international organization. I think we would progress far more rapidly if we cleaned the slate and then took on Russia only after she responded to the decencies of international conduct. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here, please.

Man: Mr. Feller, since Soviet Russia is not likely to disown its specific violations of agreement, and since we cannot condone them, what can be gained by the proposed Five Power talks?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Feller?

Mr. Feller: Well, I would hardly be one to prophesy what would come out of the Five Power talks which will be beginning very soon on the basis of a General Assembly resolution. But I will say this that those of us who believe in peace and I believe that most of the people of the world and the

people of this country, particularly, believe in peace, should urge the nations to keep right on trying their best, over and over and over again, to reach agreements which will enable the world to relax the present tension and avert the danger of another war. But in those discussions and in those proposed agreements, the main thing to keep in mind all the time is that agreements must be founded upon basic principles which are set forth in the Charter of the United Nations to which all the countries have subscribed.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, how do you propose that we deal with future aggression most effectively after the expulsion of Russia from the United Nations?

Mr. Kaltenborn: I have proposed that we then do our best to get united action, which we will never be able to get so long as Russia and her satellites are members. I believe there is essentially a unity of purpose on the part of all noncommunist nations to preserve peace. I do not believe that that is the purpose of the Soviet Union and her satellites unless she can have the kind of peace she wants—a peace of dictation, a peace of terror, a peace in which her imperialism has gotten what it wants.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Next question, please.

Man: Mr. Feller, why don't the free nations combine their resources and crush the aggressor before he has time to strike? A strike in time saves lives.

Mr. Feller: Well, that is the basic purpose of the proposals now being adopted by the United Nations which I talked about at the beginning of this broadcast. The basic purpose is to do precisely what you say, to combine the forces of the nations so as to enable them to deal with aggression at the moment it happens, or before it happens.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The gentleman over here, please.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, precisely how would expulsion of Russia make aggression any less likely?

Mr. Kaltenborn: The expulsion of Russia would not make aggression on the part of Russia and her satellites less likely until there had developed in the United Nations that cohesive action which would be much more easy after Russia's expulsion than it is while Russia is constantly interfering with any ordered progress toward the organization of peace.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, sir. Now we are delighted to welcome a lady to participate in this—the colonel's lady—and

there are so many colonels here that nobody knows who she is. Yes?

Lady: Mr. Feller, do you think that Russia will coöperate with the other United Nations countries any better now than before the Korean war?

Mr. Feller: Well, that's quite a question. The general position of the Soviet Union has been very clear all the way through. They have taken certain attitudes, and they have followed those attitudes through pretty consistently. So far as the present Assembly is concerned, the Soviet Union, while it has gone along with certain parts of the proposals which I talked about earlier, has taken its stand against some of the main parts of the proposals, and in particular, the proposals regarding armed forces.

May I say this, in response to a question which was asked of Mr. Kaltenborn, if he will only permit me? I do not see that the fact that the Soviet Union has been opposing these proposals has made it a particularly long-drawn-out affair to adopt them. The proposals were introduced in the Assembly only last month. They are very far-reaching indeed.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

ABRAHAM HOWARD FELLER—Mr. Feller is General Counsel and Director of the Legal Department of the United Nations, a post which he has held since 1946. He has been legal adviser to numerous U. N. commissions and conferences and consultant for many federal offices and organizations.

He received his law degree from Harvard University and has been on the faculty of several universities, namely, the University of Berlin, Harvard Law School, and Yale University. He was associate professor of law at the latter university. A member of the U. S. Supreme Court bar, Mr. Feller is the author of several books on legal matters.

HANS V. KALTENBORN—The dean of radio commentators, Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of a number of books and magazine articles on current events and politics. His forthcoming book is titled *Fifty Fabulous Years*.

After graduating from Harvard with an A. B. degree in 1909, he started to work as a reporter for the *Brooklyn Eagle* and remained on the paper for 20 years in the following capacities: dramatic writer, editor, editorial writer, assistant managing editor, and associate editor.

Since 1922, Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio news analyst and lecturer on current history and has received numerous citations for his outstanding service to radio and journalism. He reported on the major peace conferences of the last 20 years, and during World War II, he reported from all the major fronts.

and the General Assembly has taken only a couple of weeks to adopt them. It seems to me that that is a demonstration of the fact that the General Assembly, even though it's on a universal basis and includes 60 nations, can work just as fast as our own Congress.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the gentleman on the other aisle in the gray suit.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn. Should the Security Council be dominated by communistic nations and the U. S. pull out, will the Council survive?

Mr. Kaltenborn: No, the Council would not survive if the United States pulled out and the Council were dominated by communist nations. But there is absolutely no chance of that happening. On the contrary, the country most likely to pull out, or to be kicked out, is the Soviet Union. Consequently, I don't think that your question is germane to the probabilities.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn, I have to defend the questioner there, because in the preliminary meeting I asked that question of this audience, and that is probably what made him ask it. What happens if we recognize Soviet China, and then France goes communist? You have three against two of the Big Five. I think that's the implication of the man's question, which isn't entirely beyond possibility, is it?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, I should say, with regard to France, that it is completely beyond, now. It might not have been two or three years ago, before the Marshall Plan went into effect. France today is strong, is resolute, and is determinedly anti-communist.

As for Red China, I don't want to see us recognize Red China, and I think that there is a public opinion in the United States, which is gaining strength, that continues to oppose the recognition of Red China. (*Applause*)

Man: Mr. Feller, who could control a universal military force if the communist nations have a majority and use the force for their ends?

Mr. Feller: I'm really sorry to say that I don't quite understand the basis on which you ask your question. In the United Nations, the Soviet Union and its allies, which include the Communist Bloc, number five. There are 60 nations. That is five against fifty-five. I don't understand why you posit the idea of a communist majority.

Mr. Denny: All right, would you like to talk back, Captain?

Captain: Well, I was thinking this way. If they were to control a good part of the world, as they are attempting to do—if they got control of a number of nations—then who would handle the military force? Who would be responsible? Then would they not be in a position to do what they want to do and impose their way upon us?

Mr. Feller: Well, that's a pretty big *if*, Captain, an *if* that five can eventually become something bigger than, say, half the nations of the world. I don't really think that I can answer a question based on hypothesis which goes so far into the future.

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, should the United States support the U. N., even if the decision is against our democratic interests?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Yes, if the United States accepts the obligations that devolve upon a member of the United Nations, we are obliged to support any decision that the U. N. makes, even if we feel that that decision is against our immediate national interests.

Lady: Mr. Feller, can the United Nations restrict psychological warfare as a prime form of aggression without imposing an international censorship of freedom of speech?

Mr. Feller: There's been a great deal of discussion in the United Nations about the problem of freedom of information and the limits which states may impose upon freedom of expression. So far, it seems to me that the major interest of the United Nations is not to impose censorship upon free expression, even if that free expression sometimes goes beyond the bounds of what we would consider to be decent.

Mr. Denny: All right. Thank you, Mr. Feller, and thank you, Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn. And as we close this series of Air Force Town Meetings, I want to extend our warmest thanks to Colonel Early Duncan and his staff for their splendid cooperation in making these Air Force Town Meetings possible, and especially to Major H. M. Campbell who made the entire tour with us and who lost no opportunity to insure our comfort and to expedite the effectiveness of these programs. May I also thank our host here tonight at Bolling Field, Colonel Henry J. Amen and his staff for their coöperation and gracious hospitality.

Next week's program will originate in Oak Park, Illinois, so consult your paper and your local ABC station for details. Listen next week and every week for the sound of the Crier's bell. (Applause)

TOWN MEETING REVIEW

"The Listener Talks Back"

Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con. The letters should be mailed to Department A, Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., not later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.

The letters which are here reprinted in whole or in part are a few of the total number received up to noon of October 23, dealing with the Town Meeting of October 17: "How Should We Combat Russian Propaganda and Distortion Abroad?" The speakers were: Dr. Willard E. Givens and Senator Owen Brewster.

REFINED TECHNIQUE

"Splendid, splendid, what amazing unity! (I am) referring, of course, to the Brewster-Givens Town Meeting. What perfect dovetailing, not a feather flustered. . . . And to think back a bit — what heated, unruly affairs those meetings used to be! You have clearly demonstrated to the Iron Curtain countries your far more refined and far superior technique." — MRS. E. CANN, Chicago, Ill.

ARE WE DOGMATIC?

"The Big Truth is that neither we nor the Russians have clear-cut plans for human betterment. It is immoral to lean on human misery in the Soviet areas for our salvation. . . . Isn't it our moral duty to state that under free enterprise there are no guarantees against unemployment and despair? Dare we give up hope that both sides might acquire humility, stop the name-calling, avoid a frightful war, and become energetic rivals in a genuine effort to save and serve humanity? Or are we both fatally dogmatic about systems?" — ALVINA FRANDSEN, New York City.

TEACH AMERICAN PRINCIPLES HERE

"Unless we wish to stir up the Russian people to revolt, I do not think propaganda to them will pay.

First, we do not know whether they will hear, listen, and digest. Secondly, we could use the time and effort to better advantage . . . by teaching American principles here. Thirdly, the Kremlin has its own plans, its own goals, and its own methods; we agree with none of them. . . . The Kremlin will not become more friendly, but more tactful, because of knowledge of American ways." — DAVID STENS-VAD, St. Cloud, Minn.

PROVING GROUND IN INDO-CHINA

"It is only through our actions that we can be judged and accepted as having as our motive the betterment of the conditions of the Asian people. . . . If France is given the loan it requested to help quell the Communist aggression in Indo-China, the United States can be charged with joining the forces of imperialism in the Far East. It is my belief that if the loan to France is granted, the United States should take it upon herself to see that the native people of Indo-China are relieved of the fetters of French imperialism. . . . If we do not take this action, we are playing into the hands of Soviet propagandists, thus defeating our own purposes and losing more prestige in the Far East." — TED ARTHUR, Seattle, Wash.

VOICE OF AMERICA— PRO AND CON

"The people all over the world should know the truth about the beliefs, hopes, and fears of America. Apparently the Voice of America is not doing a 100% job in presenting the life of the average American. . . . I believe Hollywood is (also) one of our poorest ambassadors abroad, and it is time some of us made that fact realized to (those who are) responsible."

—MRS. HERBERT H. SCHAKEL, Fort Wayne, Ind.

"So far, I have never heard of any effective material used by the Voice of America, and I have never heard any specific suggestions by anybody (including the speakers tonight) which sounded promising. Most of the stuff is talk about how wonderful America is—how rich we are, how good, how kind, how brave, how generous. What we should get across to listeners are *ideas* about freedom, independence, progress, individual initiative, and coöperative action.

"The people we are talking to behind the Iron Curtain are starting from scratch. Automobiles, bath tubs, telephones, etc., don't mean anything to them. Nor do most of the stories about women's clubs, political campaigns, and college activities. We ought to simplify and get down to basic principles. . . .

"Whatever we say, the broadcasts should be given with imagination and some (realization of) what problems are likely to interest foreign listeners. We are not talking to people in Kansas City, Boston, Chicago, or Central City."

—E. D. WILLIAMS, Hempstead, N. Y.

"I listen to the Voice of America because we have overseas broadcast wave lengths on our radio, and I know they broadcast the meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations and give talks which are interesting. No one

can make me believe that the Voice of America is not a wonderful thing." —FLORINE HARTLEY, Marathon, Iowa.

"I agree with the speakers that the Voice of America is not doing as much as it should and that the programs which are broadcast are of a very inferior type. . . . Since pictures are much more impressive than words, I am wondering if the exchange students who go to various countries from America could be worked into this program.

"If (they) had pictures of their homes, showing the various rooms in the house, as well as the outside, including garage and auto, mobile, they could furnish proof that the ordinary family in America lives very much better than the average family in most other parts of the world. If pictures of the main streets of the communities from which these students come were included, together with some pictures of the different types of stores and other buildings, the true story could be told. . . .

"With such a program to start with and supplemented with broadcasts, people in other countries would become more familiar with our way of life in the United States." —J. J. SPRINGER, Oneida, N. Y.

"Why cannot the American people hear what we say (on the Voice of America)? Who decides what America is to say? We cannot expect each and every American to have a chance to broadcast his views to the world, but is there any reason why we cannot hear and know what is being broadcast?" —C. B. MARSHALL, Rockford, Ill.

(The Voice of America can be heard in most parts of this country on any radio with a short wave band and an outside aerial. Program listings are available through the Voice of America, 251 West 57th Street, New York City. —Ed.)